

A LOWER BOUND ON GOWERS' FIN_k THEOREM

ALEXANDER P. KREUZER

Gowers' FIN_k theorem, also called Gowers' pigeonhole principle or Gowers' theorem, is a Ramsey-type theorem. It first occurred in the study of Banach space theory [3], and is a natural generalization of Hindman's theorem. In this short note, we will show that Gowers' FIN_k theorem does not follow from ACA_0 .

1. HINDMAN'S THEOREM

Hindman's theorem is the following statement. As the name suggest it was established by Neil Hindman, see [4].

Theorem 1 (Hindman's theorem, HT). *If the natural numbers are colored with finitely many colors then there is an infinite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that the non-repeating, finite sums of S*

$$\text{FS}(S) := \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} s_i \mid I \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{N}) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \right\} \quad \text{where } (s_i) \text{ is the enumeration of } S$$

are colored with only one color.

In the context of reverse mathematics HT was first investigated by Blass, Hirst, Simpsons in [2]. There it was shown that it follows from ACA_0^+ , that is ACA_0 plus the statement that for all X the ω -jump $X^{(\omega)}$ exists. The best known lower bound is ACA_0 , see also [2]. It is one of the big open questions of reverse mathematics what is the exact strength of HT and whether it is equivalent to ACA_0 . There has been some partial process on this question. However no definite answer could be given. See [5, 1, 8] and [6, Section 2.3].

As already said Gower's pigeonhole principle is a generalization of HT. Below we will see that it is not provable in ACA_0 .

To understand the statement of Gower's pigeonhole principle we will first look at the following finite unions variant of Hindman's theorem. It is not to difficult to see that it is equivalent (relative to RCA_0) to HT, see [2].

Theorem 2 (Hindman's theorem, finite unions variant). *If the finite subsets of the natural numbers $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{N})$ are colored with finitely many colors there exists a infinite set $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{N})$ consisting of pairwise disjoint sets and such that the non-empty finite unions of S*

$$(1) \quad \text{NU}(S) := \{s_1 \cup \dots \cup s_n \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, s_i \in S, \max s_i < \min s_{i+1}\}$$

are colored with only one color.

2. GOWERS' FIN_k THEOREM

Before we can formulate Gowers' FIN_k theorem we have to introduce some notations. The following definitions will be made in RCA_0 .

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $p: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, k]$. We call the set the

$$\text{supp}(p) := \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p(n) \neq 0\}$$

the *support* of p . The space FIN_k we be the following.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{FIN}_k &:= \left\{ p \in [0, k]^{\mathbb{N}} \mid |\text{supp}(p)| < \omega, \exists n p(n) = k \right\} \\ &= \left\{ p \in [0, k]^{<\mathbb{N}} \mid \exists n < \text{lth}(p) (p(n) = k) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

This space will play the role of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{N})$ in Hindman's theorem. For $k = 2$ it is actually isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\mathbb{N})$.

On FIN_k we define the following order

$$p < q \quad \text{iff} \quad \max \text{supp}(p) < \min \text{supp}(q)$$

and the following partial addition for comparable elements

$$p + q \quad \text{for } p < q$$

which will be equal to the usual pointwise addition (if $p < q$).

On FIN_k we will make use of the following, so called “tetris” operation T

$$T: \text{FIN}_k \rightarrow \text{FIN}_{k-1} \quad T(p)(n) = p(n) \div 1.$$

A *block sequence* B is an infinite increasing sequence $B = (b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in FIN_k . The *combinatorial space* $\langle B \rangle$ generated by B is the smallest subsets of FIN_k containing B and closed under addition and tetris, i.e.,

$$\langle B \rangle := \left\{ \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^{k-f(n)}(b_n) \mid f \in \text{FIN}_k \right\}.$$

(Note that the above sum is finite since the support of f is finite.)

We can now formulate Gowers' FIN_k theorem.

Theorem 3 (Gowers' FIN_k theorem, $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$). *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and any finite coloring of FIN_k there exists a combinatorial subspace colored by only one color.*

We will denote full version of of Gowers' FIN_k theorem by $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$ and the restriction to a particular k by FIN_k . It is clear that for $k = 2$ this theorem is the same as Hindman's theorem since a combinatorial subspace in FIN_2 is just as the set given in (1). So in other words

$$\text{RCA}_0 \vdash \text{HT} \leftrightarrow \text{FIN}_2.$$

Moreover, it is clear that $\text{FIN}_k \rightarrow \text{FIN}_l$ if $k > l$ since FIN_l can be embedded into FIN_k via the following mapping $i(p)(n) = p(n) + k - l$.

Remark 4 (RCA_0). A combinatorial subspace $\langle B \rangle \subseteq \text{FIN}_k$ is isomorphic to FIN_k via the isomorphism $\Theta_B(f) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T^{k-f(n)}(b_n)$.

Thus, FIN_k remains true if one colors only a combinatorial subspace instead of FIN_k . This variant is equivalent to FIN_k .

3. A LOWER BOUND ON FIN_k

Theorem 5. *There exists a recursive coloring of FIN_{k+1} with 2^k many colors, such that each monochromatic combinatorial subspace computes $\emptyset^{(k)}$.*

Before we will come to the proof we will fix some notation and state a proposition. We will need computable approximations of the n -fold Turing jump. For this we shall write

$$\emptyset_{s_n, s_{n-1}, \dots, s_1}^{(n)}$$

for

$$(\dots (\emptyset'_{s_1})'_{s_2} \dots)'_{s_n}$$

(In other words the s_n -step approximation of the Turing jump of the s_{n-1} -step approximation of the Turing jump ... of the s_1 -step approximation of the unrelativized Turing jump.) If the tuple $(s_n, s_{n-1}, \dots, s_1)$ is shorter than n , we shall take the true Turing jump for the missing indexes.

Proposition 6. *For each n, m there exists a finite sequence $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ such that*

$$\emptyset^{(n)} \cap [0; m] = \emptyset_{m_n, \dots, m_1}^{(n)} \cap [0; m].$$

Moreover, we may assume that $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ is such that, taking $m_{n+1} := m$,

$$(2) \quad \emptyset^{(i)} \cap [0; m_{i+1}] = (\emptyset^{(i-1)})'_s \cap [0; m_{i+1}] \quad \text{for } s > m_i$$

where $i \in [1; n]$.

Proof. Apply the limit lemma—relative to $\emptyset^{(n-1)}$ —we obtain an m_n such that

$$\emptyset^{(n)} \cap [0; m_{n+1}] = (\emptyset^{(n-1)})'_s \quad \text{for all } s > m_n.$$

Iterating this process we obtain $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ satisfying (2). This sequence automatically satisfies the other statement of the proposition. $\square$

For an $f \in \text{FIN}_k$ with $k \geq 2$ we shall write $\mu_i(f) := \max\{n \mid f(n) = i\}$ and $\lambda_i(f) := \min\{n \mid f(n) = i\}$ and $\mu(f) := \max\{n \mid f(n) \neq 0\}$ and $\lambda(f) := \min\{n \mid f(n) \neq 0\}$. Note that μ_i, λ_i are undefined if i is not in the image of f . However μ, λ is by definition of FIN_k always defined.

Proof of Theorem 5. This proof is inspired by Theorem 2.2 of [2].

Let $f \in \bigcup_{k' \leq k} \text{FIN}_{k'+1}$. Fix an $i \geq 1$ and let $(n_0, \dots, n_l)$ be the indexes (in ascending order) where $f(n_j) = i$. We call (n_j, n_{j+1}) a *short gap_i* if

$$\emptyset^{(i)} \cap [0; n_j] \neq (\emptyset^{(i-1)})'_{n_{j+1}} \cap [0; n_j].$$

We will write $\text{SG}_i(f)$ for the number of short gaps_i in f . Note that in general $\text{SG}_i(f)$ is not computable.

We will now construct computable approximation of short gaps. Let $i, (n_0, \dots, n_l)$ as above. We call (n_j, n_{j+1}) a *very short gap_i* if

$$(3) \quad \emptyset_{\mu_i(f), \mu_{i-1}(f), \dots, \mu_1(f)}^{(i)} \cap [0; n_j] \neq \emptyset_{\mu_i(f), \mu_{i-1}(f), \dots, \mu_2(f), n_{j+1}}^{(i)} \cap [0; n_j].$$

(We treat $\mu_i(f)$ as if it were 0 if it is undefined.) E.g. for $i = 1$ we call (n_j, n_{j+1}) a very short gap₁ if

$$\emptyset'_{\mu_1(f)} \cap [0; n_j] \neq \emptyset'_{n_{j+1}} \cap [0; n_j].$$

Note that $\text{VSG}_i(f)$ is computable.

We color FIN_{k+1} with the following coloring.

$$c(f) := \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{i-1} \cdot (\text{VSG}_i(f) \bmod 2).$$

By FIN_{k+1} there is a homogeneous combinatorial subspace B .

We will write $\langle\langle B \rangle\rangle$ for $\bigcup_{i=0}^k T^i \langle B \rangle$.

Claim 1: For each $f \in \langle\langle B \rangle\rangle$ there exists $g \in \langle B \rangle$ with $f < g$ such that every short gap _{i} in f is a very short gap _{i} in $f + g$ and such that between f and g no gap _{i} is (very) short gap _{i} and not very short.

Proof of Claim 1: Recursively build a sequence $(g_i)_{i \leq k} \subseteq \langle B \rangle$ with

- (i) $g_0 > f$ and $g_{i+1} > g_i$,
- (ii) $\emptyset^{(k-i')}_s \cap [0, \mu(g_i)] = (\emptyset^{(k-i'-1)})'_s \cap [0, \mu(g_i)]$
for $i' \leq i < k$ and $s \geq \lambda(g_{i+1})$.

The proof proceeds in the same way as the proof of Proposition 6. Suppose we have chosen $g_0, \dots, g_{i-1}$, then by the limit lemma there exists an m such that the equation in (ii) is true for all $s \geq m$. Choose g_i such that $g_i > g_{i-1}$ and such that $\lambda(g_i) > s'$. Setting

$$m_{k-i} := \mu_{k+1}(g_i) \quad \text{for } i < k$$

we recover a sequence $(m_1, \dots, m_k)$ as in Proposition 6. From this we get in the same way that

$$\emptyset^{(i)}_{m_i, \dots, m_1} \cap [0, m_{i+1}] = \emptyset^{(i)} \cap [0, m_{i+1}].$$

Now consider

$$g := \sum_{i=0}^k T^i(g_i).$$

By definition we have that $\mu_{k-i}(g) = \mu_{k-i}(f + g) = m_{k-i}$. Therefore, the right hand side of (3) for $f + g$ is equal $\emptyset^{(i)}$ for $[0; n_j] \subseteq [0; \mu(f)]$. With this the claim is satisfied. $\blacksquare$

Claim 2: $\text{SG}_i(f)$ is even for each $f \in \langle\langle B \rangle\rangle$.

Proof of Claim 2: Assume that $f \in \langle\langle B \rangle\rangle$ and take again g as in Claim 1. We get

$$\text{VSG}_i(f + g) = \text{SG}_i(f) + \text{VSG}_i(g).$$

Since $f + g, g \in \langle B \rangle$, the parity of $\text{VSG}_i(f + g), \text{VSG}_i(g)$ is the same by assumption to B . Therefore, $\text{SG}_i(f)$ must be even. $\blacksquare$

We now show by induction that one can compute $\emptyset^{(i)}$ for $i \leq k$ from B . Assume that we already have an algorithm which computes $\emptyset^{(i-1)}$. To compute whether x is contained in $\emptyset^{(i)}$ or not search for an $f, g \in \langle B \rangle$ with

- (i) $f < g$,
- (ii) $x < \lambda(f)$, and
- (iii) the image of f, g contains i (this can always be achieved by searching for $f_1 < f_2 \in \langle B \rangle$ and taking $f := f_1 + T^{k+1-i}(f_2)$).

By Claim 2, we know that $\text{SG}_i(f), \text{SG}_i(g), \text{SG}_i(f + g)$ is even. Thus, $(\mu_i(f), \lambda_i(g))$ is not a short gap _{i} . (For this argument we use (iii) and the consequence that $\mu_i(f), \lambda_i(g)$ are defined.) Therefore,

$$x \in \emptyset^{(i)} \quad \text{iff} \quad x \in (\emptyset^{(i-1)})'_{\lambda_i(g)}$$

By induction hypothesis $\emptyset^{(i-1)}$ is computable relative to B . Therefore $x \in \emptyset^{(i)}$ is computable in B , too. $\square$

Remark 7. The above proof formalizes in $I\Sigma_{k+2}^0$. The critical steps where induction is used are Claim 1, and the verification of the algorithm. In Claim 1, $B\Sigma_2^0$ relative to $\emptyset^{(i)}$ for $i < k$ is used to find the m . The analysis of this the same as in the limit lemma and it is equivalent to $B\Sigma_2$. In the verification of the algorithm we have to show that, calling the algorithm for the i -Turing jump e_i , that

$$\forall x \left(\Phi_{e_i}^B(x) = 1 \leftrightarrow x \in \emptyset^{(i)} \right)$$

for all $i \leq k$. Since this statement is Π_{k+2}^0 , $I\Sigma_{k+2}^0$ is sufficient.

Corollary 8.

- (i) For all k we have that $\text{RCA}_0 + \text{FIN}_k + \Sigma_{k+2}\text{-IND}$ proves that $\emptyset^{(k)}$ exists.
- (ii) $\text{ACA}_0 + \Delta_1^1\text{-IND} + \text{FIN}_{<\infty} \vdash \forall X \forall k X^{(k)}$ exists. In other words, the above theory proves ACA'_0 .
- (iii) $\text{ACA}_0 \not\vdash \text{FIN}_{<\infty}$.

Proof. (i) is just a reformulation of Remark 7. (ii) follows from (i) by noting that $\Delta_1^1\text{-IND}$ implies $\Sigma_n\text{-IND}$ uniformly for each n using Skolemization.

(iii) follows from the following. First, $\forall X, k X^{(k)}$ exists can be written as a Π_2^1 -statement, i.e.,

$$\forall X, k \exists Y (Y_0 = X \wedge \forall i < k Y_{i+1} = \text{TJ}(Y_i)).$$

Now if $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$ would be provable in ACA_0 then the above statement would be provable already in $\text{ACA}_0 + \Delta_1^1\text{-IND}$ and a fortiori in $\text{ACA}_0 + \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}$. However, this theory is Π_2^1 -conservative over ACA_0 , see [7, IX.4.4], which leads to the contradiction $\text{ACA}_0 \vdash \text{ACA}'_0$. $\square$

4. CONCLUSION

We could show that the generalization of Hindman's theorem (HT), Gowers' FIN_k theorem ($\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$) is stronger than the best known lower bound for HT. It remains open to find a matching upper bound for $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$. It seems to be in general very difficult since to the knowledge of the author any known proofs of $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$ makes use of special ultrafilters (or similar objects). Of course by Shoenfield absoluteness $\text{FIN}_{<\infty}$ must be provable without the axiom of choice.

REFERENCES

1. Andreas Blass, *Some questions arising from Hindman's theorem*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **62** (2005), no. 2, 331–334. MR 2179959
2. Andreas R. Blass, Jeffrey L. Hirst, and Stephen G. Simpson, *Logical analysis of some theorems of combinatorics and topological dynamics*, Logic and combinatorics (Arcata, Calif., 1985), Contemp. Math., vol. 65, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 125–156. MR 891245
3. W. T. Gowers, *Lipschitz functions on classical spaces*, European J. Combin. **13** (1992), no. 3, 141–151. MR 1164759
4. Neil Hindman, *Finite sums from sequences within cells of a partition of N* , J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. A **17** (1974), 1–11. MR 0349574
5. Jeffrey L. Hirst, *Hindman's theorem, ultrafilters, and reverse mathematics*, J. Symbolic Logic **69** (2004), no. 1, 65–72. MR 2039345
6. Antonio Montalbán, *Open questions in reverse mathematics*, Bull. Symbolic Logic **17** (2011), no. 3, 431–454. MR 2856080

7. Stephen G. Simpson, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*, second ed., Perspectives in Logic, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009. MR 2517689
8. Henry Towsner, *A simple proof and some difficult examples for Hindman's theorem*, Notre Dame J. Form. Log. **53** (2012), no. 1, 53–65. MR 2925268

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE,
BLOCK S17, 10 LOWER KENT RIDGE ROAD, SINGAPORE 119076

E-mail address: `matkaps@nus.edu.sg`

URL: `http://aleph.one/matkaps/`